



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,266	05/02/2001	Muneomi Katayama	TESJ.0029	6117
38327	7590	02/02/2006		
REED SMITH LLP 3110 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 1400 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042			EXAMINER SAADAT, CAMERON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3715	
DATE MAILED: 02/02/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,266

Applicant(s)

KATAYAMA, MUNEOMI

Examiner

Cameron Saadat

Art Unit

3715

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

In response to amendment filed 8/18/2005, claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-16, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlgren (USPN 6,293,802 B1) in view of Forest (USPN 6,757,572 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Ahlgren discloses a body movement training method comprising: storing lessons comprising images of at least one trainer in a server 112 (Col. 6, lines 21-28; Col. 15, lines 5-10); providing mobile image communication (Col. 22, lines 50-56) between a trainee and a server (See Fig. 1, refs. 104 and 112); taking at least one image of the trainee at a training or sport site 104; searching the server for a lesson comprising at least one of the images of the trainer with a corresponding movement to the image of the trainee based upon a request of the trainee sent via capture/playback station 104 (Col. 10, lines 5-12) to the server 112 (Col. 12, lines 30-34); sending the searched lessons that comprise images of the trainer (Col. 7, lines 15-37) to the capture/playback station 104; displaying side by side the searched image of the trainer and the image of the trainee on capture/playback station 104 (Col. 15, lines 5-18),

Art Unit: 3715

wherein the image communication terminal is implemented by a public mobile network system, and Internet (Col. 22, lines 50-56). Ahlgren further discloses that the training method may be implemented on a computer system 1624 allowing software and data to be transferred to external devices 1602 via a *cellular phone communication terminal* (Col. 22, lines 50-56). Ahlgren does not explicitly disclose that a user may request image data from a *portable* device over a public mobile communication network. However, Forest discloses a system for providing golf instruction over a public mobile network and Internet connection to a portable mobile phone device 600, wherein a user may select an expert or golf professional to coach him or her for a variety of different portions of the golf game (See Col. 9, lines 5-13; Col. 10, lines 27-35; Col. 7, lines 22-25). Hence, in view of Forest, it would have been obvious to an artisan to modify the computing system described in Ahlgren by allowing a user to request training image data from a *portable* device over a public mobile communication network and Internet, in order to provide training over a global network to users in multiple locations using hand-held computers, wherein the users seek training in a sporting activity (See Forest, Col. 12, lines 58-64; Col. 5, lines 1-5).

In addition, the fact that a claimed device is *portable* or movable is not sufficient by itself to patentably distinguish over an otherwise old device unless there are new or unexpected results. In re Lindberg, 194 F.2d 732, 93 USPQ 23 (CCPA 1952)

Regarding claim 2, Ahlgren discloses a body movement training method, wherein the images are displayed side-by-side on the same screen of the mobile image communication terminal without being overlapped for comparison and training (column 15, lines 5-18).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Ahlgren discloses a body movement training method further comprising sending an image of the trainee to the server for storing (Col. 6, lines 21-26);

searching for and requesting a lesson plans (Col. 12, lines 30-34) that comprise images of a trainee (Col 7, lines 15-37) to be compared and examined for difference between actions.

Regarding claims 5-8, Ahlgren discloses a body movement training method wherein one of the images of the trainer and the trainee comprises a set of moving frames, and the other of the images is a still image (column 15, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 9-16 and 22, Ahlgren discloses a body movement training method wherein the images of the trainee and of the trainer are taken at substantially the same place (Col 3, lines 20-30).

Regarding claim 20, Ahlgren discloses a body movement training method wherein the displaying stem includes displaying at least one of letters and symbols requested by the trainer to make a training point (Col. 14, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 21, Ahlgren discloses a body movement training method wherein the images of the trainee are taken at different places (Col 15, lines 24-29).

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlgren (USPN 6,293,802 B1) in view of Forest (USPN 6,757,572 B1), further in view of Katayama (USPN 5,857,855)

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Ahlgren and Forest discloses all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing that the image of the trainee before a training session is compared to an image of the trainee after a training session. However, Katayama teaches a method of teaching body motions wherein a pre-training image is placed side-by-side with a post-training image of the trainee (Col. 5, line 63 – Col 6, line 9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the improvement analysis method described in the combination of Ahlgren and Forest, by providing side-by-side pre and post training images, in light of the teachings of Katayama in order to determine how much improvement has taken place or how much and what type of improvement is needed in the training process.

Regarding claims 18 and 19, the combination of Ahlgren and Forest discloses all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing displaying a grid (as per claim 18) with an

Art Unit: 3715

image of a trainee or providing lines as moving body parts (as per claim 19). However, Katayama teaches a method of teaching body motions wherein a grid and reference lines are utilized when analyzing images (See Fig. 9a-c; 10a-d). It would have been obvious to an artisan to modify the image analysis methods described in Ahlgren and Forest, by providing grids and lines during image analysis, in light of the teachings of Katayama in order to provide reference points and linear diagrams to help the trainee understand correct body movement.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant also makes an assertion that Ahlgren does not disclose the feature of searching a server for an image of a trainer *based upon a request of the trainee* sent from a portable mobile phone communication terminal. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ahlgren discloses the feature of searching a server for a particular lesson, and providing options for choosing specific instructor and lesson type (Col. 10, lines 5-12; Col. 12, lines 30-34), and wherein the lessons comprise various images of trainers (Col. 7, lines 15-37).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3715

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cameron Saadat whose telephone number is (571) 272-4443. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica S. Carter can be reached on (571) 272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cameron Saadat
January 29, 2006



Monica S. Carter
MONICA CARTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER